

Calendar No. 1882

82D CONGRESS
2d Session

SENATE

REPORT
No. 1939

RAHEL ZAKAR PETERS

JUNE 27, 1952.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 4466]

The Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4466) for the relief of Rahel Zakar Peters, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon without amendment and recommends that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Rahel Zakar Peters. The bill provides for an appropriate quota deduction and for the payment of the required visa fee and head tax.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The beneficiary of the bill is a 42-year-old native of Turkey and a citizen of Syria. She last entered the United States as a visitor on November 22, 1948. She married a United States citizen on July 11, 1949, and divorced him June 8, 1951. She appears to be alone in the world except for her relatives here who are well able to provide for her.

A letter dated February 11, 1952, to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives from the Deputy Attorney General with reference to the case reads as follows:

FEBRUARY 11, 1952.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
*Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
 House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request for the views of the Department of Justice relative to the bill (H. R. 4466) for the relief of Rahel Zakar Peters, an alien. The bill would grant Mrs. Peters permanent residence in the United States.

The files of the Immigration and Naturalization Service of this Department reflect that Mrs. Rahel Peters nee Zakar was born on March 18, 1910, at Khar-pout, Turkey, and is a citizen of Syria. She last arrived in the United States at the port of New York on November 19, 1948, and was admitted on November 22, 1948, as a temporary visitor to April 9, 1949, upon the posting of a \$500 departure bond. She received several extensions of stay, the last of which expired on January 20, 1951. On March 27, 1951, a warrant of arrest in deportation proceedings was issued against her charging that she is illegally in the United States in that after admission as a visitor she has remained here for a longer time than permitted by law. On October 15, 1951, Mrs. Peters' application for voluntary departure was granted and it was ordered that her departure be effected within 30 days after notification of decision. On January 10, 1952, the Board of Immigration Appeals dismissed the alien's appeal from this order.

The alien was married on August 11, 1949, at Los Angeles, Calif., to Mr. George Peters. She separated from him on December 23, 1949. On June 8, 1951, the superior court, county of Los Angeles, granted the alien a divorce on her cross complaint and ordered Mr. Peters to pay her \$70 per month for 6 months. The alien stated that she had no one in the "old country" and that during her visit in the United States she wanted to get married and thereby possibly become eligible to remain in the United States. She met Mr. Peters in January 1949, and had been out with him only four times prior to their marriage. She has no children.

The alien was formerly employed in a cigarette factory in Syria rolling cigarette papers but has not been employed since her mother's death in 1947. She stated that she was supported by charitable organizations in Syria and also received assistance from her sister in Los Angeles, Mrs. Maritza Eskander, whose husband is employed in the maintenance department of the Columbia Pictures Corp., Hollywood, Calif. The cost of the alien's passage to the United States was paid by Mrs. Eskander, by whom she is supported and with whom she resides in Los Angeles.

The quota of Turkey, to which the alien is chargeable, is oversubscribed and an immigration visa is not readily obtainable. The record fails to present considerations sufficient to justify granting her a preference over other aliens who also desire to obtain the benefits of residence in the United States but who, in compliance with the law, remain abroad and await their regular turns for the issuance of an immigration visa.

Accordingly, the Department of Justice is unable to recommend the enactment of the instant measure.

Sincerely,

A. DEVITT VANECH,
Deputy Attorney General.

The files of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives contain the following letter in connection with the bill:

DEMOCRATIC STATE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF CALIFORNIA,
Los Angeles, Calif., August 7, 1951.

Re H. R. 4466.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
*Member of Congress, House Office Building,
 Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. CELLER: This letter is written to you on behalf of Rahel Zakar Peters for whom the above bill was introduced by Congressman Yorty. The bill was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary on June 13, 1951.

Mrs. Peters' uncle, Elea Chavoor, 1025 South Manhattan Place, Los Angeles 19, and her cousin, Evelyn Chavoor, are long-time friends of ours. She also has one sister in Los Angeles, and no relatives whatever in Turkey.

She is about 41 years old. It would cost her relatives about twice as much to support her in Turkey as it does here, and if she were sent back and had to wait to return under the quota, it would take about 15 years.

Anything you may be able to do to get this bill through will be greatly appreciated.

With kind regards.

Sincerely,

GLENN M. ANDERSON,

Chairman, Democratic State Central Committee.

The committee, after consideration of all the facts in the case, is of the opinion that the bill (H. R. 4466) should be enacted.

○

She is about 41 years old. It would not be surprising if she had to wait some time for the trial as it does not seem that she had to wait to return under the prison. I would take about 15 years.

Anything you may be able to do to get the information will be greatly ap-

preciated.

With best regards,

Charles M. Johnson
Chief, Domestic Security Council Committee

The committee after consideration of all the facts in the case is of the opinion that the bill (H. R. 1400) should be enacted.